

Name of	No. of	Amount involved 4058081.00	No. of officials punished
Circle J&K	complaints		One
Gujarat	03	1460.00	One
H.P.	3,371	37,34,841.00	One
Haryana	15,396	1,23,45,380.00	Three
Kerala	426	3,07,448.00	Twenty Three
Karnataka	37	99,357.90	Twenty four
Madhya Pradesh	6973	20,77,466.00	Eleven
Maharashtra	40,103	40,05,145.00	Nil
North East	315	28,200.00	Nil
Orissa	1,724	14,82,248.00	Nil
Punjab	13,053	10,67,535.00	Nil
Rajasthan	4,073	50,72,500.00	Two Hundred sixteen
Tamil Nadu	4,105	35,44,589.00	Nineteen
U.P.-	31,577	1,95,83,162.00	One Hundred Forty Six
West Bengal	13,036	65,45,000.00	Nil
TOTAL	176,523	13,85,34,579.90	Four Hundred Forty nine

GDP in the year of 2000-2001

† 597. SHRI BRATIN SENGUPTA: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

- the rate of Gross Domestic Product achieved at the end of the year 2000;
- whether it is a fact that the target has not been achieved to some extent;
- if so, the reasons therefor; and
- the target fixed for next year with regard to Gross Domestic Product and the steps taken to achieve it?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE

† Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

(SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL) (a) to (d) As per the Advance Estimates released by the Central Statistical Organisation, the growth rate in real gross domestic product (GDP) at factor cost is estimated at 6.0 per cent for 2000-2001 compared with 6.4 per cent in 1999-2000. The lower growth in 2000-2001 is attributed in particular to lower growth in GDP originating in manufacturing, financial, insurance, real estate & business services and community, social & personal services in 2000-2001 compared with 1999-2000. Growth targets are not fixed annually. However, the GDP growth target for the Ninth Five Year Plan (1997-2002) is fixed at 6.5 per cent per annum on an average. The various economic reform measures undertaken so far are expected to have a favourable impact on the economy. These reform measures cover area of trade, exchange rate, foreign investment, financial sector, industry, infrastructure, taxation, expenditure management etc.

'Jurisdiction of Narcotics Control Bureau'

598. SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have studied the Delhi High Court's verdict given sometime in the second week of December, 2000 that the Narcotics Control Bureau set up in 1986 as the apex coordinating agency under the Narcotics Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act has no power to investigate any of the drug-peddling cases booked over the years;

(b) if so, what are the implications involved with regard to the pending and decided cases based on NCB's investigations; and

(c) the manner in which Government propose to solve it?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI GINGEE N. RAMACHANDRAN): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c) Government has filed an appeal alongwith the stay application against the judgement of the Delhi High Court in the Supreme Court of India. The apex court has been pleased to grant stay of the Delhi High Court's judgement. Hence, as on date there is no change in the status of the pending and decided cases, based on